DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 057 **IR 006 129**

AUTHOR	Brown, Doris R.
TITLE	Retention of Dewey Decimal Classification at DePaul University Library.
INSTITUTION	De Paul Univ., Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE	8 Nov 77
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classification; Library Expenditures; *Library Technical Processes; *Systems Analysis; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	Dewey Decimal Classification

ABSTRACT

While many libraries joined the trend to convert to the Library of Congress classification scheme in the 60's and early 70's, DePaul University Library never made a definitive decision about retaining Dewey or converting to LC. The realization that benefits from standardized classification can be realized using the Dewey system and cost considerations for reclassification are important factors in proposing that DePaul retain the Dewey Decimal Classification scheme. The library would receive greater and more far-reaching benefits by expending time and money on a total online automated system that would tie together the functional departments of the library: Acquisitions and Serials, Cataloging, Reference, and Media and Circulation. The system would consist of a basic local file that would use a broader system such as MARC tapes or the OCLC data base for online formation of the bibliographic record. A total automated system would follow an item from point of searching through ordering and receipt, on to cataloging and then to circulation, providing necessary subject access along the way. More comprehensive subject access and increased access points lead to better service for faculty and students. (Author/JAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED160057

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RETENTION OF DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION

AT DE PAUL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doris R. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR 006 129

Doris R. Brown
Technical Services Librarian
DePaul University Library
November 8, 1977

RETENTION OF DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION AT DE PAUL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Library literature of the 60's and the early years of this decade abounds with articles and papers on the advantages and disadvantages and the methods and procedures for conversion to the Library of Congress classification system. Many libraries decided at that time to convert to the Library of Congress System (LC), whether from the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) or some other local adaptation of a recognized classification system. Mowery's study[1] cites 162 college and university libraries adopting LC during the four years from 1968-71, raising the total number of LC users to 635 (54.7% of the total sampling of 1,160 colleges and universities). Of the 429 institutions using DDC at the end of 1971, 363 (86.6%) indicated an intention to keep DDC, 12 (2.9%) indicated future use of some other system, and 44 (10.5%) expressed uncertainty. Most of the 162 libraries converted to LC because they were using a local classification system, based on Dewey, LC, or some other scheme, which could no longer grow to keep up with the increased volume of materials and new subjects in the 60's. Conversion to LC meant employing a clerk to copy a complete call number from the Library of Congress cards on proof slips for most books, a very persuasive argument for large libraries with huge numbers of volumes received annually. Even the now-outdated report (1965) of the Classification Committee of the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section[2], after comparing DDC and LC, recommended Dewey for libraries with general collections up to 200,000 volumes in size, and the Library of Congress system for those expecting to be larger.

DePaul University Libraries fit into the "uncertain" category, since no conscious decision about retention or conversion to LC has beem made to date. This decision is necessary, however, as we plan our use of automated systems and our future participation in regional, state, and national networks. Economy and the future implications of LC and DDC must be foremost in our minds, especially as costs continue to escalate and the nineteenth edition of Dewey looms on the horizon. This decision is critical now because revision of local cataloging and classification policies, incorporation of all library materials into the classified collection, and production of an updated union subject catalog, are all being postponed until our long-range classification plans are finalized.

This study will not pretend to present classification theory nor to find which is the better system, the Dewey Decimal system or the Library of Congress system. Both have advantages and disadvantages, but there is no one "better" classification system. Either system is capable of grouping materials by subject and allowing the user to find materials through the card catalog and, to a certain degree, through browsing. Our concern focuses on the practical economics of retention of Dewey compared to conversion to LC, but some background is essential in presenting those economics.

The Dewey Decimal Classification system is built on a base of ten subject classes numbered from 0 to 9: 000 General Works, 100 Philosophy, 200 Religion, 300 Social Sciences, 400 Languages, 500 Pure Science, 600 Technology (Applied Science), 700 The Arts, 800 Literature (Belles-Lettres), 900 History. Each class may be broken down into divisions, the divisions into subdivisions or "sections", and so on in a hierarchical, logical order of the general to the specific. The Dewey system uses numbers for classification, allowing expansion of general numbers through decimal numbers to allow for special aspects of general subjects. Although Dewey provides for grouping like subjects together, the reality is that any given subject pertains to several disciplines, so a work is classed according to the main emphasis of the discipline. Dewey allows broad or close classification, so that a small, general library may cut the class number at a given point to keep all books on Illinois history together, unlike the large, research library which expands the number to provide closer analysis, bringing books on the gangster era together and books on the Daley period together. New subjects can be incorporated into DDC by extending the number of digits used after the decimal point, or by relocating items within the existing scheme.

The necessity for relocation caused by the ever-growing and ever-shifting body of knowledge is the reason for the editions of the Dewey Decimal Classification which force libraries to reclassify materials according to the latest edition or run the risk of having a somewhat discordant subject arrangement. The eighteenth edition appeared in 1971, with 396 relocations from the seventeenth (1965), and the nineteenth edition is already scheduled for adoption by the major national libraries (Library of Congress, National Library of Australia, British Library, and the National Library of Canada) on January 1, 1980. The nineteenth edition will present a totally new schedule for sociology and some relocations of political processes and parties, with expansion and refinement in other areas.[3] Libraries must decide whether to relocate materials according to the latest Dewey edition or to retain use of old editions for some subjects and to utilize the new edition for other materials. The latter decision results, in effect, in a classification scheme which may look the same to the user, but scatters the subject organization of the collection and destroys the "logical order" of the Dewey system.

At DePaul, volumes reclassified because of different Dewey editions, different Cutter tables (to be discussed later), or variant cut-off points for suggested classification numbers, numbered 1792 for fiscal year 1975-76, and 1334 for fiscal year 1976-77. Since the sheer volume of material prohibits all relocation necessary to keep current with the latest Dewey edition, and the new editions do not always provide the same features as the old, the Cataloging Department has evolved various practices using editions earlier than the eighteenth Dewey for some areas. In psychology, for example, the numbers of major authors in the field have changed with different editions of Dewey so that each work receives original classification to keep one author's works together. In philosophy, the fourteenth edition of Dewey (1942)

is used for some authors because they have their own Dewey numbers in that edition, but not in later editions.

Added to these local practices related to the different Dewey editions are the special policies created in the past simply to "better" DDC. Some are no longer in use: the science schedule devised by DePaul science professors for the Lincoln Park Campus has been abandoned. Others, such as the special schedule for Shakespeare at Lincoln Park Campus Library, continue, even though time and patron use have never proven them to be more effective than the official DDC schedule. In effect these local adjustments and practices create a classification scheme unique to DePaul.

The Decimal Classification Division had long been regarded as the Library of Congress' token admission that as the de-facto national library it has responsibilities to the U.S. library world not using its classification system, but complaints from Dewey libraries about the alarming increase in Library of Congress cards with no suggested Dewey numbers have stimulated the Library of Congress so that this complaint now has less validity, especially for MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging) tape items. Of the 4273 books with copy cataloged by DePaul University Libraries on OCLC (Ohio College Library Center) from November, 1976, through June, 1977, 2606 (61% of total OCLC records used) Library of Congress-input records had a suggested Dewey number; only 56 (1%) of the Library of Congress-input records lacked a suggested Dewey number. Added to this figure are the 364 (9%) OCLC member-input records which gave a Dewey number, for a total of 71 percent of the OCLC records used which provided a suggested Dewey number.

Even though the OCLC system has helped to greatly increase the cataloging output -- by 36 percent for a comparable six-month period (2047 copy-catalog titles added from November, 1975, to April, 1976, compared to 3181 from November, 1976 to April, 1977), the 71 percent of the OCLC records used which gave a suggested Dewey number were incomplete, as are all suggested Dewey numbers. A complete call number consists of the Dewey number and the Cutter number, but, since the Cutter number which provides for alphabetical subdivision after the individual class number is not an automatic part of DDC, the Library of Congress does not include a Cutter number with the suggested Dewey number. Thus the Dewey number suggested by the Library of Congress for the book by Raimund E. Matthis, Adopting the Library of Congress classification system, is 025.49, but each library must consult the Cutter-Sanborn table to determine that M431 will represent the author and complete the call number: 025.49 M431. The steps involved when the Dewey number is suggested are: 1) determine if there is a local special policy for the subject; 2) if no special policy, decide on the cut-off point for the suggested Dewey number; 3) check the Cutter-Sanborn table and record the Cutter number; 4) check the shelf-list to avoid duplication of the call number; 5) record the call

number, (both on-line and manually). Conversion to LC, as will be explained later, would mean immediate acceptance of the complete call number as assigned by the Library of Congress, which has to give each piece of material a classification number and a "cutter" number to record that piece in its own shelflist.

At DePaul University Libraries, the confusion in call numbers for the same book owned by each campus' library, which resulted from the lack of a union author/title card catalog before June, 1975, and the use of different Dewey editions, has been complicated in the past by the use of three different Cutter tables: the two-figure Cutter table, the three-figure Cutter-Sanborn table, and the three figure Cutter table. There are, therefore, discrepancies in classification because of interpretation of the Dewey tables, the use of different editions of Dewey, ambiguity of cut-off point for the Dewey number, local practices to accommodate relocations or to "better" Dewey, and the use of different Cutter tables. While none of these is catastrophic to the user who approached the collection through the catalog, they do place works on the same subject by the same author in different areas of the library and prevent a completely integrated collection, without extensive reclassification to adhere to the latest Dewey edition, an impossibility for a sizable collection to attempt every ten years.

The Library of Congress classification system is a practical scheme, originally designed to arrange and manage the collection at the Library of Congress alone. The scheme is contained in 30 schedules, grouping the broad subjects of human knowledge by alpha-numerical combinations, with more than one schedule for broad subjects such as language. The individual schedules are:

A.	General Works, Polygraphy
B, pt.1, B-BJ.	Philosophy
B, pt.2, BL-BX.	Religion
C.	Auxiliary Sciences of History
D.	General and Old World History
E-F.	American History
G.	Geography, Anthropology, Folklore, Manners and Customs, Recreation
H.	Social Sciences
J.	Political Science
K.	Law
L.	Education
M.	Music and Books on Music
N.	Fine Arts
P-PA.	Philology, Linguistics, Classical Philology, Classical Literature
PB-PH.	Modern European Languages
PG, in part.	Russian Literature
PJ-PM.	Languages and Literature of Asia, Africa, Oceania, America, Mixed Languages, Artificial Languages

PN,PR,PS,PZ.	Literature (General), English and American Literature, Fiction in English, Juvenile Literature
PQ, pt.1.	French Literature
PQ, pt.2.	Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese Literatures
PT, pt.1.	German Literature
PT, pt.2.	Dutch and Scandinavian Literatures
Q.	Science
R.	Medicine
S.	Agriculture, Plant and Animal Industry, Fish Culture and Fisheries, Hunting Sports
T.	Technology
U.	Military Sciences
V.	Naval Science
Z.	Bibliography and Library Science

The single capital letters for the main classes or the double letters for the main divisions are combined with numbers for further subdivision. The author number or "cutter" number, taken from the LC author tables, completes the call number, with whatever symbols (e.g. dates) necessary to distinguish a particular work or edition. Thus, the LC call number for the Matthis work on Adopting the Library of Congress classification system is Z 695.98 M33; the subject, library cataloging, is represented by Z 695.98, and the author, by M33.

The schedules vary for each subject so they must be used for classifying a work within that subject. Some schedules have individual indexes, and there are now available two general indexes to the classification scheme, but there is as yet no official index from the Library of Congress itself. Widespread use of LC necessarily brings an ongoing revision of the schedules and their applicability to growing fields of knowledge. Revisions have been and will be necessary; the LC system allows for revision and expansion through differing alpha-numerical combinations in the schedules, through use of gaps left in the schedules and in the author notation tables, and through the use of decimals. The impact of such additions and revisions for the internal workload isn't as overwhelming as those of a Dewey edition, however, because they occur on a piecemeal basis and are accepted as given for all new materials by libraries which use the Library of Congress call number with no change. Such libraries, in effect, use the Library of Congress shelflist for their own purposes. A library which might attempt to keep materials together by subject and so change the Library of Congress assigned call number would doubtless feel the same burden as Dewey libraries feel whenever a new edition is released. These LC revisions and changes prevent complete subject integration as much as the Dewey editions.

Even through DePaul University Libraries have been using the Library of Congress cataloging, including name authorities and subject headings, as obtained from Library of Congress printed cards, the National Union Catalogs, and the OCLC system, there are problems connected with adoption of the LC classification system. Series pose the greatest problem simply because of their

innate complexity and instability, but the Library of Congress has contributed to their troublesome nature by failing to give uniform treatment to numbers of the same series, sometimes classing together and sometimes classing separately, or by classing together broad monographic series which for smaller libraries might be better classed according to the subject of each monograph. A common example is the treatment of the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society which the Library of Congress classes under "Q11" for general scientific publications published by American societies, with no concern for the philosophical or historical nature of many of the publications. The automated authority files soon to be operative at the Library of Congress should alleviate the first problem somewhat, and alternative call numbers lessen the second problem for series done recently by the Library of Congress. If DePaul were to convert to LC, the approach to the series question would be to accept the latest treatment from the Library of Congress, building the series authority file on that treatment, but making local decisions more consistent with the collection and the curriculum whenever necessary. Of course, this represents a deviation from the Library of Congress and so reduces the benefits of accepting their work without alteration.

The "Z" schedule for bibliography presents a problem to libraries which may wish to class bibliographies in the subject area. Alternative call numbers provided by the Library of Congress do allow subject classification for recently processed materials, but the problem remains for older materials. Deviating from the "Z" schedule to provide for subject classification brings the local practices which ultimately destroy the economies of LC. Another major problem area is LC's "PZ" schedule for standard and current fiction including English translations of foreign authors; use of this schedule obviously poses as many problems as the use of "F" and a Cutter number to arrange fiction in Dewey collections. Presently alternative call numbers in the literature of the author's country are available on Library of Congress records, but earlier materials would have to be classed originally to avoid use of the "PZ" schedule. It should be clarified, however, that alternative numbers provided by the Library of Congress are incomplete call numbers just like the suggested Dewey numbers, in that they often omit the "cuttering" element, that is the author number or other symbols (such as year of edition) to distinguish a particular book. An extra step is added, therefore, to the classification process when electing to use an alternative number rather than the complete LC call number as assigned.

Having considered the two systems, the main argument for conversion to LC from DDC is based on the fact that the use of DDC prevents a Dewey library from realizing the same cost reduction from an automated, standardized system available to an LC library which accepts all call numbers exactly as assigned by the Library of Congress or other member libraries. Studies comparing the rate of classification using DDC or LC indicate the advantage is held by LC. The Morrisons' pre-automation study[4] showed that

"three books can be classified in LC in the same time that it takes to do two in the Dewey-Cutter system" (p.238). Hewitt found the same in his study of the charter members of OCLC[5]: of the 35 libraries able to provide data on production rates for cataloging with records in the data base, the mean rate for 25 libraries using LC was 14.9 titles per hour, while the rate for libraries using DDC was 12.9 titles per hour, but these figures are misleading because in the Dewey libraries figures are based on a procedure which necessitated calling the record up twice before production of cards, first by pre-catalog searchers who transferred the information for off-line checks of authority files, classification schedules, and shelf lists, and second, by a professional who revised the preprofessional work and actually "produced" the cards. The LC procedure allowed first-time acceptance of Library of Congress- or OCLC member-input records, adapted when necessary under strictly defined conditions by the preprofessional staff. Comparison of DePaul University Libraries with three CALC (Chicago Academic Library Council) members using LC (Roosevelt University Library, Loyola University Library, and Governor's State University Library) shows that cataloging production is 68 percent of the average per terminal output of the other three LC libraries (683--Roosevelt; 681 per terminal--Loyola; 746--Governor's State, compared to 530 for DePaul, from November, 1976, through April, 1977). While continuing to streamline workflow in the Catalog Department may reduce the percentage of difference, cuttering and shelflisting, steps which are removed by copying LC numbers as assigned by the Library of Congress, will continue to be essential steps in using Dewey.

Adoption of the LC classification system, however, does not involve merely changing the OCLC profile, starting a new shelf list, and closing the Dewey stacks. Careful and cautious thought must be given to the future of the existing Dewey collection. Reclassification of the Dewey collection into the LC classification is a monumental task, even if considered only from the viewpoint of the Cataloging Department, but the staff of both libraries must be involved in all tangential areas. The collection must be weeded before any reclassification starts so that outdated and superseded material can be withdrawn and discarded. DePaul's Lewis Center Library has been weeded for multiple copies in some subject areas, and the same process has begun at Lincoln Park Campus Library, but complete weeding of every subject field must be finished before that field can be reclassified. Mending and re-binding are not in themselves a part of reclassification, but they cannot be separated because as each volume is handled to change the markings, the need for mending and repair or, in some cases, replacement cannot be ignored.

The production of a union subject catalog might be seen as a major benefit to result from a reclassification project, but in effect the union subject catalog would have to be a separate project since complete access cannot be delayed for the decades necessary to complete reclassification. The subject catalog must be brought up to date with the latest Library of Congress subject headings, with all necessary changes and cross-references, before it can be interfiled to produce a union subject catalog for each library. Leaving aside the logistics of using the same cards for a union subject catalog project and a reclassification project, the subject catalog might have to be duplicated twice, once for the union subject catalog and once as part of the reclassification project.

An initial decision must be made before reclassification begins as to the amount of recataloging to be done as problems arise in the Dewey collection. The extent and necessity of such recataloging can only be estimated, but from the problems which were identified in the union author-title catalog project of 1975, it is clear that recataloging would be substantial. Reclassification would provide an opportunity, of course, to bring together under the same call number those copies of the same title which have been located, for all the reasons stated earlier, under different call numbers.

All card production for reclassification would be done through OCLC, primarily to eliminate the tedious tasks of erasing the call number and any other areas to be changed or corrected on the catalog card and then typing in the new information, and secondly to build an archive of DePaul's holdings in the OCLC data base. The printer attached to the terminal would be used to print the labels for the book, the card, and the pocket, so physical processing would involve only crossing out the Dewey number on the "spy leaf" and writing in the new LC call number; removing or blacking out the call number on the spine; affixing the new call label and a label protector; and pasting labels on the card and pocket.

The reclassification project is proposed as a separate unit in the Cataloging Department with a minimum of one full-time professional cataloger with LC experience to coordinate and direct the unit, two preprofessionals (level 6), and approximately 30 hours of student help per week. The professional catalogers in the Cataloging Department would be responsible for recataloging, but the reclassification professional, under the direction of the Technical Services Librarian, would be in total control of the project and would exercise final judgment in questions of proper classification, name or series authority, quality of cataloging, or subject assignment.

The extent of reclassification of the Dewey collection provides endless discussion, so for purposes of this study, partial reclassification with a closed collection in DDC will be viewed as

counter to full student and faculty use of the libraries. The future may show total reclassification to have been an unattainable goal, but then time may prove a better judge of what material has enough usage to merit the cost of reclassification. The reference collections obviously could be reclassed first, since they constitute the most utilized materials in the libraries and serve as introductions to the rest of the collection. The next material to be reclassified would be selected from: 1) the circulating collection as materials are returned; 2) the material corresponding to the "A" schedule of LC to facilitate shelving material in the new stack area; 3) Dewey blocks proceeding in numerical order from 0 to 9 to allow the old stacks to be freed as space needs dictate, without having to shift books to close gaps in the middle of the Dewey collection; 4) Dewey classes which have heavy, long-range use, such as literature and history, and proceeding to those which may allow future weeding based on material whose useful life is shorter. This study proposes the fourth option because it promises the steadiest work flow according to an established shelf order for the heaviest used materials.

More than half of DePaul's collection (250,000 volumes today compared to approximately 115,000 volumes as of 7/1/69) should be included in the MARC records which began in 1969 for English-language materials. The OCLC system which is based on MARC tapes should contain a large number of the records necessary for reclassification. The extent and quality of such coverage is impossible to determine, however, so manual searching of the National Union Catalogs by the preprofessional staff and original classification by the professional cataloger must be included in the work flow. Reclassification from DDC to LC has not been the major use of the OCLC system, however, so library literature ignores that aspect of its use. A local sampling of the OCLC records for reclassification proved inconclusive for time estimates, but did point out that careful revision and editing is essential since local cataloging or NUC copy already in the card catalogs may vary considerably from Library of Congress or OCLC member cataloging available on the terminal. This was corroborated by Illinois State University Library at Normal, which has a sophisticated reclassification operation utilizing the OCLC system for reclassification of the last 30,000 of the Dewey books to be reclassed remaining from their conversion to LC in 1967. Parenthetically, the Milner Library at ISU is maintaining a closed Dewey collection in storage which will not be reclassed. Their goal of 500 books per month (present output is just below 300) will be used as the standard for the reclassification project. Student labor will be used for the routine tasks which have been timed; time estimates and sources will follow a description of the duties.

The broad steps and personnel involved in reclassification are:

I. Students
   A. Pull truck of books in numerical sequence from shelves--20 min/truck (DePaul University Library, Circulation Dept., LPC)
   B. Pull shelf list, mark it "Reclass", check missing copies or volumes on shelf list card, pull card set from public catalog, write temporary slip, file one copy under main entry in card catalog, send for other library's copies and pull other library's card set--5 min. (Hitchcock, Jennette E., "Cost estimates and time schedules", p. 196, in The Use of the Library of Congress classification [Chicago, 1968])

II. Preprofessional staff
   A. Check series and updated subject list and make changes on main entry.
   B. Search OCLC data base
      1. Library of Congress input record
         a. Edit subjects if necessary to update and produce cards.
         b. Add LC call number to main entry and shelf list and OCLC number to main entry; discard other cards (shelf list used as OCLC order record and main entry rides with book to labelling section)
         c. Set aside for labelling section.
      2. Library of Congress copy in hand from card set.
         a. Edit as necessary and input.
         b. Add LC call number to main entry and shelf list and OCLC number to main entry; discard other cards.
         c. Set aside for labelling section.
      3. OCLC member input record
         a. Print all copy and any other pertinent record (e.g. Library of Congress input record for more recent edition)
         b. Correct information on printed copy as necessary; add LC call number to main entry and shelf list and OCLC number to main entry; discard other cards
         c. Send to professional cataloger.
   C. Search National Union for copy if no record on OCLC.
      1. If Library of Congress copy, edit and input as II.B.2 above.
      2. If only contributed copy, xerox and send to professional cataloger for review or original classification.
      3. If no copy, send to professional cataloger for original classification.

III. Professional cataloger
   A. Review pre-MARC copy for questions of name or series authority, subject assignment, tagging, etc.
   B. Revise OCLC member copy and return to preprofessional to produce.
   C. Review contributed copy or assign original classification (e.g. for DePaul original cataloging) and return to preprofessional to produce.

IV. Students
- A. Produce labels for spine, book card, and book pocket on terminal printer using OCLC number on main entry card; cross out Dewey number and write in LC number in book; remove old spine label and affix new spine label with call label protector; paste new labels on book card and pocket--4 min./volume (Hitchcock, ibid., p.195)
- B. Shelve truck of books in LC stacks--50 min./truck (DePaul University Library, Circulation Dept., LPC)
- C. File cards in author/title and subject catalogs when received from OCLC-- .6 min./card (Hitchcock, ibid., p.196)

As stated above, the cost for those activities to be handled by student assistants will be calculated on an hourly basis, at $2.50 per hour. The cost of full-time reclassification personnel will be figured on the basis of annual salaries (professional with experience--$13,000; preprofessionals--$8400). The OCLC charge has increased to $.60 per reclassification produce; card costs remain at $.039 per card. Other equipment will be listed at current approximate prices in a table with the other costs of conversion. The recurring costs for personnel, OCLC charges, and supplies will be listed both as a total figure for 250,000 volumes (200,000 titles) and as an annual figure for 6,000 titles. Card withdrawal, production, and filing is always doubled to include both libraries. These costs do not, however, encompass all costs of reclassification; travel between the two campuses or transportation of physical volumes between the two libraries and xeroxing costs for local copying or non-OCLC card production have been excluded. Tangential projects described earlier, such as weeding and mending, are not treated. The figures which are presented must be seen for what they are--mere estimates, with no accurate projection for escalating costs and inflation. It would be possible, of course, to compound the annual figure (for 6,000 titles) to include current inflation rates, but that projection would not be valid for the duration of the reclassification project. Total reclassification of the present collection at the rate of 500 titles per month would take 33 years; even exaggerating the workload to 750 titles per month would require 22 years for completion.

Cost of conversion to Library of Congress Classification
Equipment and other costs for initial conversion:

OCLC CRT terminal	$ 3,700.00
Printer from OCLC terminal	3,000.00
6 book trucks	900.00
5 desks and chairs	2,600.00
3 book cases	600.00
3 electric typewriters	1,800.00
LC schedules	300.00
Cumulation of additions and changes to LC schedules	825.00

Index to LC schedules	$ 1,145.00	
OCLC profile change	50.00	
Consultant on LC classification	500.00	
Total initial costs	$15,420.00	

Recurring costs for reclassification:	250,000 vols. (200,000 titles)	6,000 titles annually
Student personnel:		
Pull books from Dewey shelves (110 per truck)	$ 1,895.00	$ 47.00
Pull card sets, write and file temporary entry	83,332.00	2,500.00
Remove old labels and apply new labels; cross off Dewey call no. and write in new call number	41,665.00	1,000.00
Shelve books in LC stacks	4,735.00	115.00
File new cards	50,000.00	1,500.00
Full-time personnel:		
Professional cataloger	429,000.00	13,000.00
Preprofessional catalog assistants	554,400.00	16,800.00
OCLC charges:		
Reclass and produce charge	120,000.00	3,600.00
Cards	78,000.00	2,340.00
Processing supplies:		
Labels for books, pockets, and cards	208.00	30.00
Call label protectors	8,750.00	210.00
Total recurring costs	$1,371,986.00	$41,142.00

The cost of reclassification is clearly astronomical, as has been experienced by every library which undertook reclassification in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Many of these libraries hastily adopted a policy of partial reclassification after the costs and time projections rose with each passing year. Partial reclassification of the Reference collections and other material fitting criteria based on long-range use is, of course, a possibility. Provisions would have to be made, of course, to reduce potential confusion, whether real or psychological, for patrons. The cost of partial reclassification can be computed from the figures for 6,000 titles reclassed annually.

Conversion to LC was an attractive option to libraries in the 60's whose collections were scattered into various local adaptations of Dewey or some other system, or who realized the economic benefits to be gained from acceptance of the classification produced by the Library of Congress. The economics of standardization, however, did

not prove great enough in many cases to justify reclassification of the total collection from the old system to LC, so many libraries opted for partial reclassification, maintaining a dead or in-storage collection classed in the old system. The costs of reclassification today outweigh the major advantage of potentially faster cataloging through complete acceptance of the call number as provided by the Library of Congress; LC does not provide a "better" classification system.

This study recommends, therefore, that DePaul University Libraries retain the Dewey Decimal Classification system, but that local adaptations and schedules be studied for their long-range usefulness compared to standard schedules. Anything which does not produce results far superior to the standard should be dropped. Reclassification as necessary has to be undertaken to bring like collections together for the two libraries so that an automated system can be fully utilized. When the nineteenth Dewey is released, it should be adopted with relocation of materials already in the collection limited to areas that are absolutely essential, avoiding establishment of more local policy and special practices. Energies should be expended, instead, for providing full access to the Library's total holdings, including audiovisual and microform materials.

Discussion of several other developments must be included as part of any decision on conversion to LC or retention of DDC. The first is that classification as a means of subject arrangement may have less importance in years to come, serving as a secondary system of subject arrangement or in some cases only as an indicator of physical location. Subject access has always been the aim of classification systems, but the computer via new subject arrangement such as PRECIS (Preserved Context Index System)[6] promised a more perfect access than either LC or DDC.

Secondly, as Freedman warns, "rational librarians would not choose to generate, on any cyclical basis, entire card catalogs to supersede previous card catalogs."[7] Automated alternatives to the card catalog have been discussed ever since computers were first introduced into libraries, since they promised the rapidity and currency that manual systems could never achieve. Book catalogs were adopted by some libraries, but their limitations soon became evident when updated cumulations were delayed by printing or became more expensive because of rising paper prices. Microfilm was first seen as a means of protecting library card catalogs from vandalism and deterioration, but computer output microfilm (COM) development[8] has shown that microform catalogs can successfully supplement or replace the card catalog and the book catalog. Machine-readable data bases, either for individual libraries or for several libraries with a regional or subject basis, provide the material for fast, accurate catalogs or holdings lists on microfilm or fiche.[9] Full utilization of computer technology, however, goes further to provide on-line access via a CRT

terminal to a bibliographic data base which can be searched by author, title, subject, classification number, ISBN (International Standard Book Number) or ISSN (International Standard Serials Number), and whatever other access points are deemed useful. Obvious advantages are the immediacy of information, through both more currency and more physical locations, and expanded access points. The inconsistencies which have plagued card catalogs when changes in names, entry, or subjects were made, can be eliminated immediately with automated authority files which allow for update of all entries or headings to the latest form. Large libraries, forced by the size and use of their card catalogs, have undertaken or are planning some form of automated catalog at varying times in the future.[10] The Library of Congress intends to close its catalog in 1980, using instead various forms of automated catalogs and files depending on the needs and uses of library departments.

Northwestern University Library and Stanford University Library have in their NOTIS and BALLOTS systems achieved a local unified file giving access to the order file, the in-process file, the author-title catalog, the serials check-in and holdings record, the circulation file, and to some extent in BALLOTS to the subject catalog.[11] The University of Chicago's system is planned to provide these same points of access.[12]. These on-line library operations provide total support for all technical services, circulation, and reference, increasing efficiency and control and reducing repetition of tedious tasks.

This study further recommends, therefore, that DePaul University Libraries plan for automation of all manual files recording repetitive operations in both public and technical services. Any system or package which is examined should be carefully considered for compatability with future plans for automation so that eventually there will be a total system indicating what has been ordered, what has been received, what has been cataloged, and what has been charged out. No system should be purchased until it is clear what planning exists for that system to share other data bases and what priorities in computer time and technical assistance within that system are assigned to DePaul University Libraries.

1. Mowery, Robert L., "The 'trend to LC' in college and university libraries," Library Resources and Technical Services, 19 (1975), 389-97.

2. "Statement on types of classification available to new academic libraries," Library Resources and Technical Services, 9 (1965), 104-11.

3. Library of Congress Information Bulletin, 36, (April 18, 1977), 240.

4. Morrison, Perry D., and Catharine J. Morrison, "Use of Library of Congress classification decisions in academic libraries--an empirical study," Library Resources and Technical Services, 9 (1965), 235-42.

5. Hewitt, Joe A., "The impact of OCLC," American Libraries, 7 (1976), 268-75.

6. Austin, Derek, and Jeremy A. Digger, "PRECIS: the Preserved Context Index System," Library Resources and Technical Services, 21 (Winter 1977), 13-30.

7. Freedman, Maurice J., "The automation of cataloging," Library Trends, 25 (January, 1977), 703-21.

8. Spaulding, Carl, "A primer on COM (Computer-Output-Microfilm), an alternative to computer printout," American Libraries, 7 (1976), 468-69.

9. For a description of a catalog derived from OCLC tapes, see Richard W. Meyer and John F. Knapp, "COM catalog based on OCLC records," Journal of Library Automation, 8 (1975), 312-21.

10. Bierman, Kenneth J., "Automated alternatives to card catalogs: the current state of planning and implementation," Journal of Library Automation, 8 (1975), 277-98.

11. Horny, Karen, "Automation of technical services: Northwestern's experience," College and Research Libraries, 35 (1974), 364-69; Technical Services Division, Northwestern University Library, untitled description of NOTIS (Nov., 1974); "Stanford University's BALLOTS system," Journal of Library Automation, 8 (1975), 31-50; Veaner, Allen B., "BALLOTS - the view from Technical Services," Library Resources and Technical Services, 21 (Spring 1977), 127-46.

12. A recent article discussing the Chicago system is Charles Payne, et al., "The University of Chicago Library Data Management System," Library Quarterly, 47 (January, 1977), 1-22.